A. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS
1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda
4. Approval of Draft Action Minutes of October 17, 2013*; Approval of Revised Minutes of September 19, 2013* (to record the vote on 15 mph School Zone).
5. Approval and Order of Agenda
6. Update on Administration/Staff
7. Announcements
   a. Consideration of consolidation of Public Works and Transportation Commissions has been postponed indefinitely.

B. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
   * Written material included in packet
   ** Written material to be delivered at meeting
   *** Written material previously mailed
   The public may speak at the beginning of any item.
1. AC Transit Line 51 Corridor Delay Reduction and Sustainability Project**
   Continuation of October 17 presentation by AC Transit staff

2. Ashby/Highway 13 Improvement Projects on Tunnel Road
   Verbal Update for Discussion by Farid Javandel

3. Safe Routes to Schools - Presentation
   Discussion of program resources and process
   Rachel Davidman, Education Program Manager, Safe Routes to Schools Alameda County

C. INFORMATION ITEMS AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS
   Information items can be moved to Discussion or Action by majority vote of the TC.
1. Subcommittee Reports (Verbal reports from Bicycle, Parking TDM, Pedestrian, Traffic Calming, Transit, Subcommittees and Public Works Liaison)
2. Council Summary Actions 2013*
3. Link to Council and Agenda Committee Agendas and Minutes
   http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/citycouncil/
4. Draft Local Hazard Mitigation Plan http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Mitigation/
5. Invitation to Downtown Berkeley BART Station Plaza 12/10/13 Public Meeting

D. COMMUNICATIONS
   Supplemental Communications distributed to TC at 10/17/13 Meeting:
   AC Transit Line 51 CDRS project:
1. Sean Marciniak
Transportation Commission Agenda
Thursday, November 21, 2013

2. Michael Katz
   Line 51 and Tunnel Road Bike Lane:
3. Steve Gere
   Ashby/Hwy 13 Improvement Projects:
4. 10/15/13 Draft of Tunnel Road Bike Lane Improvements from Geoff Rubendall
   Communications received by staff at 10/17 Meeting (published in TC web packet).
5. Maulin Chokshi, University Avenue Association - Copy of petition to Mayor, Council, and AC Transit with approximately 495 signatures re AC Transit Line 51 CDRS Project
   Communications received since 10/17/13:
6. Taylor Bennett re Bike Lane on Tunnel Road*
7. David Cooke email and attachments re Tunnel Road Class 2 Bike Lane*

E. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
   Adopt 2013 Meeting Schedule - Jan
   Adopt 2013 Work Plan – Jan or Feb
   Ashby/Hwy 13 Corridor Projects
   Election of Officers - Feb
   Electric Vehicle On-Street Charging-
   Traffic Calming Implementation Policy- Jan
   Traffic Calming Program-2013 Applications Update- Jan

F. ADJOURNMENT
   Agenda Posted: November 15, 2013

A complete agenda packet is available for public review at the Main Branch Library and at the Transportation Division front desk.

ADA Disclaimer

“In this meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location. To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at 981-6342 (V) or 981-6345 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.”

Communications Disclaimer

Communications to Berkeley boards, commissions or committees are public record and will become part of the City’s electronic records, which are accessible through the City’s website. Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to a City board, commission or committee, will become part of the public record. If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the secretary of the relevant board, commission or committee. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the secretary to the relevant board, commission or committee for further information.

Commission Secretary: Farid Javandel, Transportation Division Manager, 1947 Center St., 3rd Floor, Berkeley, CA, 94704, Telephone (510) 981-7061, Fax: (510) 981-7060 TDD: (510) 981-6345 email: Fjavandel@ci.berkeley.ca.us
October 17, 2013

VIA EMAIL [FJavandel@CityofBerkeley.info; transportation@cityofberkeley.info]

City of Berkeley
Transportation Commission
Farid Javandel, Secretary
Transportation Division
1947 Center Street – 3rd Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: Public Comment Concerning AC Transit Line 51 Corridor Delay & Sustainability Project

Dear Mr. Javandel and Members of the Commission:

Miller Starr Regalia represents AMI, LLC ("AMI"), whose principal is Mr. Daryl Ross, the owner of various properties in the City of Berkeley with businesses that include Caffe Strada, the Freehouse restaurant, and the Bancroft Hotel. We wish to communicate various concerns that Mr. Ross has expressed regarding potential environmental, historical, and business impacts that proposed changes to the AC Transit Line 51 bus route ("Project") may have on the community, including the patrons and employees of AMI's businesses. We also wish to share some concerns that Mr. Ross has expressed regarding the process by which the City is considering AC Transit's Project, where the proposal does not appear to include critical information such as a supporting traffic study.

Miller Starr Regalia submitted a public comment letter on September 13, 2013 to AC Transit ("Letter to AC Transit"), in which we articulated a number of Mr. Ross' concerns about Project-related traffic congestion, the potential generation of toxic air contaminants, and disruption to the important cultural and historical setting that characterizes the intersection of Bancroft Way and College Avenue. These potential costs would occur for the sake of improving transit time by approximately 17 seconds, if AC Transit's calculations are correct. (Route 51 Service and Reliability Report (Dec. 19, 2008), p. 27 [Table 4.4].) We hereby incorporate that letter by reference, and it is attached for your convenience as Exhibit A.

This letter is intended to supplement the Letter to AC Transit. To this end, we wish to emphasize the importance and necessity of providing the public with more information about the Project. That is, while there exists information showing the
need to expedite bus travel through the City of Berkeley, the City also must publicly disclose and consider technical traffic studies, as well as other relevant environmental reports, prior to considering approval of the Project. Simply, the AC Transit Project would entail wide-sweeping changes to the circulation network, and it appears the public record on this matter contains little to no information on what collateral effects, environmental and otherwise, could result. The preparation of traffic and other studies is necessary to apprise the public, fully and fairly, about the consequences of the Project, and also necessary to satisfy environmental review requirements pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. ("CEQA," Pub. Res. Code, § 21000 et seq.) The public record also should provide landowners with information so that they can evaluate whether AC Transit’s proposal would require the taking of private property or otherwise unlawfully interfere with the enjoyment of private property rights.

The prospect of the Project having significant and unintended negative impacts is more than conjecture. AMI has retained an expert traffic consultant firm, Kittelson & Associates, Inc. ("Kittelson") that has prepared a preliminary analysis identifying various studies that must be undertaken (e.g., various traffic signal warrant studies) so that decisionmakers and the public properly can account for any potential adverse consequences of AC Transit’s proposal. Further analysis has the potential to show that adverse impacts would occur, such unanticipated delays on Bancroft Way and increased safety risks to students and other pedestrians. Indeed, preliminary analysis shows that vehicle speeds would increase as a result of Project improvements, creating the potential for more auto-pedestrian accidents. The City also should consider the fact that, regardless of what additional improvements it may approve, the drivers of automobiles must, by law, stop where a pedestrian enters into a marked or unmarked crosswalk at an intersection. (California Vehicle Code, § 21950(a).) Given the frequency of pedestrian use at the intersection of Bancroft Way and College Avenue, the proposed traffic improvements could, from a practical standpoint, result in much less reductions in transit delay than the 17 seconds contemplated, if any at all. This consideration, too, warrants further study. Kittelson’s preliminary traffic study, addressing these and other issues, is attached in full to this letter as Exhibit B.

Resources/Populations Affected by Project. As more fully discussed in the Letter to AC Transit, each of AMI’s businesses, including Caffe Strada, the Bancroft Hotel, and Freehouse Restaurant, are locally- and family-owned enterprises. They also have become well-respected, with Caffe Strada winning numerous awards. In addition to that success, AMI’s businesses have been featured in several films, and can count among their patrons a number of well-known persons, including important authors and United States Supreme Court justices.

Meanwhile, Mr. Ross and AMI have given back to the community. The café, hotel, and restaurant have been exemplary corporate citizens in Berkeley, regularly contributing to City-supported efforts such as the Berkeley Food and Housing project, Alameda County Food Bank, the Ecology Center and the Berkeley Free
Clinic. Caffe Strada, in addition, has received a mayoral commendation for its efforts to support the community at times of need and hardship.

**Concerns About City’s Approval Process.** Thus far, there appears to be only limited information on AC Transit’s Project. While AC Transit has published a *Route 51 Service and Reliability Report* ("Reliability Report"), and while this report explains how various improvements would expedite traffic along the current bus route, it does not appear to identify or discuss how bus route improvements would affect roadway segments and other elements of the circulation system that do not lie along the bus route. The letter attached hereto as Exhibit B, prepared by an expert traffic consultant, further speaks to these considerations. Moreover, while traffic improvements most immediately affect traffic congestion, there exist a host of secondary impacts, such as effects on aesthetics, air quality, and the noise environment, that warrant study.¹ The public record does not appear to include information on any of these resources and, to the extent the *Reliability Report* contains any traffic information, it is now five years old, and likely out of date.

Nor does AC Transit or the City appear to have provided members of the public with information about whether the proposed improvements would encroach upon private property, raising questions about eminent domain and unlawful interference with private property rights. The documentation available for public review also does not, but should, indicate exactly what discretionary approvals the City must consider and issue to implement the Project.

In sum, members of the public — and perhaps even the City’s decisionmakers — have not had a chance to understand what consequences could ensue from approval of AC Transit’s proposal. It is imperative that the City prepare traffic and other environmental studies so that its citizens and government officials can make informed decisions. Not only is the circulation of such analyses necessary to satisfy due process requirements, but it is necessary to satisfy the mandates of CEQA.²

---

¹ Many of these concerns are set forth in great detail in the incorporated Letter to AC Transit.

² The City does not appear to have identified to the general public what entitlements are necessary to implement the Project, but it would appear, at the very least, that an encroachment permit is required. Such a permit must be issued where one seeks to construct a post, sign, or other structure on or over a public right of way (see Berkeley Municipal Code, §§ 16.18.010, 16.18.020). In considering the approval of an encroachment permit, the City exercises judgment regarding, and may impose conditions protecting, the public health, safety, and appearance. (Berkeley Municipal Code, §§ 16.18.050, 16.18.060.) This type of decision is discretionary, and thus triggers the need for environmental review under CEQA. (Pub. Res. Code, § 21080(a).)
If the assumptions behind the Project are accurate, the proposed improvements near the intersection of Bancroft Way and College Avenue would save less than 20 seconds in bus commute time. *(Reliability Report, p. 27 [Table 4.4].)* Less severe measures may be available at the junction of College Avenue and Bancroft Way, or less-intrusive measures may be available at other intersections; however, due to the absence of an objective traffic study to support AC Transit’s proposal, it is not possible to make that determination. Such disclosure is a fundamental requirement of CEQA and other applicable law, and it is apparently absent here.

Mr. Ross respectfully asks that AC Transit and the City of Berkeley conduct more detailed analysis of the bus route modifications and, thereafter, reconsider the improvements that AC Transit currently has proposed at or near the intersection of Bancroft Way and College Avenue.

We wish to restate that Mr. Ross remains committed to assisting the City in more properly vetting the Project. We recognize that delays along the AC Transit Line 51 bus route have created inconveniences for many citizens of the City of Berkeley, but ask that this process be conducted with greater openness and sensitivity to the health and environment of those living, working, and operating businesses near the proposed Project improvements.

Sincerely,

MILLER STARR REGALIA

Sean R. Marciniak

SRM:srm
cc: JoAnne Dunec, Esq.
    Daryl Ross, AMI, LLC
    Will Buller, AC Transit (via email - planning@actransit.org)
    Tammy Kylo, AC Transit (via email - planning@actransit.org)
September 13, 2013

VIA EMAIL [planning@actransit.org]

Tammy Kyllo
Administrative Coordinator
AC Transit
1600 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94612

Re: Public Comment Concerning AC Transit Line 51 Corridor Delay & Sustainability Project

Dear Ms. Kyllo:

Miller Starr Regalia represents AMI, LLC, whose principal is Mr. Daryl Ross, the owner of various properties in the City of Berkeley with businesses that include Caffe Strada, the Freehouse restaurant, and the Bancroft Hotel. We wish to communicate various concerns that Mr. Ross has expressed regarding potential environmental impacts that proposed changes to the AC Transit Line 51 bus route ("Project") may have on patrons and employees of Caffe Strada, the Freehouse restaurant, and the Bancroft Hotel, all of which sit directly along this bus route as it passes at or near the intersection of College Avenue and Bancroft Way. Some of these impacts, which include greater emissions of toxic air contaminants and noise pollution, are not localized, but would affect the community in general.

In addition, we ask AC Transit and the City of Berkeley to consider impacts on the important cultural and historical setting that Caffe Strada and the Bancroft Hotel comprise, discussed below.

It is Mr. Ross’ hope that AC Transit and the City of Berkeley will propose different traffic improvements near the junction of College Avenue and Bancroft Way, or consider alternative traffic improvements at less sensitive locations along the bus route, that would reduce or eliminate the Project’s potential environmental and cultural impacts.

Proposed Project Improvements. We understand that the Project, as currently proposed, includes two facilities at or near the intersection of College Avenue and Bancroft Way, including a traffic signal at this intersection and a bus bulb to be located northwest of this intersection. It is our understanding that such
improvements would reduce delay at this junction by approximately 17 seconds. 
(Route 51 Service and Reliability Report (Dec. 19, 2008), p. 27 [Table 4.4].)

Cultural, Historic, and Economic Value of Businesses Affected by Project. 
Caffe Strada, the Bancroft Hotel, and Freehouse Restaurant are locally- and family-owned businesses. They also have become well-respected. For instance, during its 25 years of operation, Caffe Strada has garnered many accolades and awards such as Best Cafe and Best Coffee — for many years running — from the Daily Cal, the East Bay Express, and other publications. The cafe is enjoyed by more than 1,000 people per day, and has been named one of the 50 best college coffeehouses in the United States by Complex Magazine.

But these businesses are more than economically successful. Along with the Bancroft Hotel, Caffe Strada has become part and parcel of the City’s cultural and historical landscape. Both businesses have been featured in several films, such as Men’s Club (starring Harvey Keitel and Jennifer Jason Leigh) and Junior (starring Arnold Schwarzenegger, Danny DeVito, and Emma Thompson). Meanwhile, the cafe, hotel, and the Freehouse restaurant have hosted many well-known people in past years, including Christopher Hitchens, Robert Kennedy Jr., former Labor Secretary Robert Reich, Poet Laureate Robert Haas, Governor Jerry Brown, and Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor and Ruth Bader Ginsberg. Al Gore, during his vice presidency, made a special visit to Caffe Strada to try the White Chocolate Mocha, a drink that originated at the cafe and since has been much copied by establishments ranging from Starbucks to Peet’s Coffee & Tea. Many people have met and proposed to their spouses at Caffe Strada, and a researcher at the University of California, Berkeley credits Caffe Strada with being the place where he discovered a famous theorem. On a more daily basis, the cafe serves as the meeting place for professors and students, with professors holding office hours and teaching assistants hosting study groups on the property.

These businesses also have historical and architectural resonance. For instance, Caffe Strada is listed as a City of Berkeley landmark structure of importance, and its unique, extensive outdoor seating have attracted attention throughout the years from University of California, Berkeley Environmental Design professors, who have remarked that the cafe offers a perfect symbiosis between cafe goers, passers-by, and community. These same professors regularly task their students with measuring and drawing the outdoor seating area at Caffe Strada as an exemplar of public and private seating.

The cafe, hotel, and restaurant have been exemplary corporate citizens in Berkeley, regularly contributing to City supported efforts such as the Berkeley Food and Housing project, Alameda County Food Bank, the Ecology Center and the Berkeley Free Clinic. Strada Cafe, in addition, has received a mayoral commendation for its efforts to support the community at times of need and hardship.
As a focal point for the Berkeley community for so many years, the café, hotel, and restaurant should not be burdened by the noise and emissions associated with the idling of significantly more cars and the construction of the traffic improvements — adverse effects that would occur under the proposed Project. Simply, noise, traffic, and air quality pollution associated with the Project would threaten the cultural setting associated with these businesses.

Mr. Ross also has a business interest in reducing traffic congestion in the vicinity of Caffe Strada and the Freehouse restaurant. For instance, Caffe Strada's reliance on outdoor seating, situated within feet of College Avenue and Bancroft Way, is particularly susceptible to disruption caused by idling vehicles and diesel emissions. Noise and pollution likely would cause professors, students, study groups, and other patrons to go elsewhere.

Second, there exist health and safety concerns as well, affecting a substantial portion of the population. As stated above, on any given day, dozens of employees and more than 1,000 patrons spend time in Mr. Ross' properties — which is to make no mention of the thousands of people that frequent other surrounding uses on a daily basis, such as the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. All of these individuals would be affected by any change to the circulation network that would expose them to greater traffic safety hazards, air contaminants, and noise pollution, as set forth in greater detail below.

**Potential Impacts of Project Construction.** While the construction of proposed traffic improvements at the intersection of College Avenue and Bancroft Way may result in incremental time savings at the intersection's northbound approach, we respectfully ask that AC Transit consider negative impacts that likely would result. For instance:

* There is no evidence that traffic signal warrants (i.e., the thresholds at which traffic congestion justifies installation of a traffic signal) are met at this intersection (and various other intersections along the bus route for which improvements are proposed), which would result in significant traffic delays at intersection approaches that buses do not use.

  - Significant delay and congestion at other intersection approaches would, in itself, qualify as an environmental impact, both individually and cumulatively.

  - Significant delay and congestion, as identified above, would result in secondary environmental impacts concerning air quality and noise, both individually and cumulatively. For instance, the queuing of vehicles in the vicinity of cafés, restaurants, hotels, residences (including dormitories and single family residences), and other sensitive receptors could
cause unacceptable cancer and non-cancer risks associated with vehicle emissions of diesel particulate matter and other toxic air contaminants.

- While traffic improvements such as bus bulbs may reduce transit times, they also have the potential to create safety risks and increase vehicle congestion. For instance, Bancroft Avenue accommodates a great number of delivery trucks that service the University of California, Berkeley campus, and narrowing this segment of the roadway has the potential to create significant risks to pedestrian and bicycle traffic, as well as patrons of AC Transit.

The aforementioned impacts do not appear to have undergone study, either in the vicinity of the intersection of College Avenue and Bancroft Way or along any of the other roadway segments or intersections for which changes are proposed. To this end, approval of the Project only may occur after AC Transit and/or the City of Berkeley have conducted full review of its construction and operation pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA;" Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq). Given the nature and scale of the changes proposed here, we would expect that an environmental impact report would prove necessary so that governmental decisionmakers — and the public — can fully understand the Project’s impacts. Such a CEQA document should include, at minimum, a traffic impact study, noise analysis, and health risk assessment. Mr. Ross looks forward to participating in this process and assisting the lead agency in identifying environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives that would minimize environmental impacts.

Alternatives, solutions. Again, Mr. Ross recognizes the vital services to the community that AC Transit Line 51 provides, and the necessity of improving its operations. At the same time, Mr. Ross remains concerned that the proposed changes, particularly in and around the intersection of College Avenue and Bancroft Way, may result in significant impacts that AC Transit and the City of Berkeley have not considered. It would appear, to save less than 20 seconds in bus commute time, that less severe measures may be available at the junction of College Avenue and Bancroft Way, or that further time-saving measures may be proposed at other intersections where there would be fewer impacts to businesses, the City’s cultural setting, and the environment in general (e.g., due to the presence of fewer sensitive receptors). Mr. Ross respectfully requests that AC Transit and/or the City of Berkeley devote greater consideration to alternative measures, and incorporate them where feasible, so as to eliminate some of the Project’s more disruptive physical changes to the circulation network and the City of Berkeley’s cultural and historical landscape.

* * *

We recognize that delays along the AC Transit Line 51 bus route have created inconveniences for many citizens of the Cities of Berkeley, Oakland, and Alameda.
Still, Mr. Ross respectfully asks that AC Transit and the City of Berkeley reconsider the improvements they currently have proposed at or near the intersection of College Avenue and Bancroft Way, especially given the relatively minimal times savings these improvement would effect, and given the potential environmental and other impacts that these improvements may cause.

Mr. Ross is committed to working with AC Transit and the City of Berkeley in identifying ways to improve the efficiency of AC Transit Line 51 without impacting the environment in such a potentially significant manner. We believe that there exist many creative and cooperative options, and we look forward to assisting AC Transit and the City of Berkeley, to the extent it desires, in identifying such solutions. Thank you for your attention to these important matters.

Sincerely,

MILLER STARR REGALIA

Sean R. Marciniak

cc: JoAnne Dunec, Esq.
Daryl Ross, AMI, LLC
Will Buller, AC Transit (via email - planning@actransit.org)
October 17, 2013

Farid Javandel
City of Berkeley
1947 Center Street – 3rd Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704

RE: Technical Support for Public Comment on AC Transit Line 51 Corridor Delay & Sustainability Project

Dear Mr. Javandel,

We are submitting this letter to supplement the public comment letters submitted by Miller Starr Regalia’s Sean Marciniak on September 13, 2013 and October 17, 2013 in connection with the AC Transit Line 51 Corridor Delay & Sustainability Project (hereinafter referred to as the Project). Mr. Marciniak represents AMI, LLC, whose principal—Mr. Daryl Ross—is the owner of various properties in Berkeley, including Caffé Strada, Free House, and the Bancroft Hotel.

Like Mr. Marciniak, Mr. Ross, and the Project’s stakeholders, Kittelson & Associates is committed to improving the efficiency of AC Transit Line 51 while maintaining acceptable levels of service for other travel modes. At Mr. Ross’ and Mr. Marciniak’s request, Kittelson & Associates reviewed the modifications proposed by the Project to the Bancroft Way & College Avenue intersection, conducted a field visit to evaluate existing conditions, and drafted this letter of support.

We hope that you will find our technical opinions and recommendations valuable in your quest to improve service on Line 51.

Sincerely,
KITTELSOHN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Mark Bowman, P.E.
Senior Principal Engineer

Jorge A. Barrios
Project Manager
SETTING

The focus of our evaluation is the area around the stop controlled intersection of Bancroft Way and College Avenue in Southside Berkeley, CA. The intersection is located just south of, and adjacent to, the University of California, Berkeley campus and surrounding land use is mixed, including a restaurant/bar (“Free House”), a coffee shop (“Caffe Strada”), and a hotel (“Bancroft Hotel”).

In the project vicinity, Bancroft Way is a one-way (westbound), two-lane collector street with parallel parking on both sides. College Avenue is a two-way, two-lane north-south collector street with parallel parking on the east side and motorcycle parking on the west side. The intersection is currently controlled by stop signs on all vehicle approaches.

Bancroft Way slopes down at approximately 9 percent between Piedmont Avenue and College Avenue, with some sections as steep as 13 percent. College Avenue rises at approximately 6 percent when traveling northbound between Durant Avenue and Bancroft Way.

Given its central location near campus, the intersection experiences heavy pedestrian and bicycle volumes, as well as frequent parking maneuvers and truck deliveries. Bancroft Way has also been the location of several large construction projects in recent years, the most notable being Boalt Hall and the Lower Sproul redevelopment.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Route 51 Service and Reliability Report (December 19, 2008) produced by AC Transit identified two potential improvements at the intersection of Bancroft Way & College Avenue. The improvements—a bus bulb-out on the far-side of the intersection and a new traffic signal—are expected to reduce transit delay on the segment by approximately 17 seconds\(^1\).

**Figure 1: Expected Transit Delay Savings.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Segment Name</th>
<th>Average Total Delay</th>
<th>Max Total Delay</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Time Saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shattuck/University: Center to Milvia</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Active Management, Signal Adjustments</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>College: Webster to Ashby</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Signal Adjustment; Stop Sign Removal; Stop Relocation or Bus Bulb</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>College: Alcatraz to Claremont</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Signal Adjustment; Parking Adjustment; Alter Driveways to SafeWay/Access from Claremont</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8th St: Harrison to Broadway</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Loading Zones/Double Parking Enforcement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Broadway: Pleasant Valley to College</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Que Jump; Signal Adjustment; Bus Island; Stop Relocation to F5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>College: Channing to Bancroft</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Channing Removed; Signal at Bancroft to safely control turn movements &amp; ped</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bancroft/ Shattuck: Ellsworth to Kittridge</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>No Recommendation at this Time</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>University: Curtis to San Pablo</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Que Jump Using Parking Lane</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 4.4 of the Route 51 Service and Reliability Study (2008). Page 27

The traffic signal recommendation is based on a desire to “safely control” turning movements by buses and the heavy pedestrian crossing activity at the intersection.

Kittelson & Associates was unable to locate any other studies regarding the proposed modifications at Bancroft Way & College Avenue, including signal warrant and/or environmental impact studies.

---

\(^1\) As seen in Figure 1, the original recommendation also included a bus stop removal (Channing Way). However, Channing Way & College Avenue is not listed as one of the stops to be removed in page 39 of the Route 51 Service and Reliability Report (2008).
TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

This section provides a brief introduction to the engineering studies that apply to traffic signal installation projects, such as the one proposed at Bancroft Way & College Avenue. As explained below, the 2012 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) states that engineering studies should be performed to determine whether the installation of a traffic control signal is justified at a particular location.

Traffic Signal Warrants

Kittelson & Associates has not been able to find traffic signal warrant studies conducted as part of the Route 51 Service and Reliability project.

The 2012 CA MUTCD specifies under Section 4C.01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals that:

01 An engineering study of traffic conditions, pedestrian characteristics, and physical characteristics of the location shall be performed to determine whether installation of a traffic control signal is justified at a particular location.

02 The investigation of the need for a traffic control signal shall include an analysis of factors related to the existing operation and safety at the study location and the potential to improve these conditions, and the applicable factors contained in the following traffic signal warrants:

- Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume
- Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume
- Warrant 3, Peak Hour
- Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume
- Warrant 5, School Crossing
- Warrant 6, Coordinated Signal System
- Warrant 7, Crash Experience
- Warrant 8, Roadway Network
- Warrant 9, Intersection Near a Grade Crossing

03 The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.
Traffic Signal Warrant Evaluation

Although a study of all traffic signal warrants is out of the scope of this report, the following sections outline the applicability of the traffic signal warrants that will be evaluated in this study.

Warrant 3: Peak Hour

The Peak Hour signal warrant ("Warrant 3") is intended for use at a location where traffic conditions are such that for a minimum of 1 hour of an average day, the minor-street traffic suffers undue delay when entering or crossing the major street.

Kittelson & Associates will evaluate Warrant 3 if peak hour traffic volumes can be obtained.

Warrant 4: Pedestrian Volume

The Pedestrian Volume signal warrant ("Warrant 4") is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay in crossing the major street.

Since the proposed signal is at a location with a stop sign controlling the street that pedestrians desire to cross, Warrant 4 is not applicable. The CA MUTCD includes the following language:

The Pedestrian Volume signal warrant shall not be applied at locations where the distance to the nearest traffic control signal or STOP sign controlling the street that pedestrians desire to cross is less than 300 feet, unless the proposed traffic control signal will not restrict the progressive movement of traffic.

Warrant 7: Crash Experience

The Crash Experience signal warrant ("Warrant 7") is intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider installing a traffic control signal. For Warrant 7 to be met, all of the following conditions must apply at the study intersection:

1. Adequate trial of alternatives with satisfactory observance and enforcement has failed to reduce the crash frequency; and
2. Five or more reported crashes, of types susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal, have occurred within a 12-month period, each crash involving personal injury or property damage apparently exceeding the applicable requirements for a reportable crash; and
3. The traffic volume requirements of Warrant 2 (Four-Hour Vehicular Volume) or the pedestrian volume requirements of Warrant 4 (Pedestrian Volume) must be met for each of any 8 hours of an average day.
Kittelton & Associates is in the process of reviewing the three-year crash history at this location to provide a preliminary evaluation of this warrant. The data are to be obtained from the California Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS).

In the meantime, a preliminary review of the crash data was conducted through the UC Berkeley Transportation Injury Mapping System’s visualization tool—which uses SWITRS data. The tool identified two injury crashes at the intersection during the most recent three-year span on record (2009-2011). An April 23, 2009 crash involved a pedestrian and a motor vehicle that unsafely started or backed into a parking spot. An October 15, 2011 crash involved a bicycle traveling at unsafe speeds. The crash summaries are provided in Appendix B.
CONCLUSIONS

As previously stated, we share AC Transit’s desire for a faster and more reliable Line 51. Improving transit service is an important way to reduce driving and increase transit ridership and non-motorized travel. This in turn benefits the environment, public health, and pedestrian-scale businesses such as Caffé Strada, Free House, and Hotel Bancroft. This report seeks to provide technical recommendations that serve that purpose and maintain a positive pedestrian experience and safety for all modes of travel.

At the west crosswalk on Bancroft Way at College Avenue, pedestrians currently enjoy the right-of-way due to the stop signs for the vehicular approaches to the intersection. Introducing a traffic signal is likely to result in the following changes:

- Pedestrians desiring to cross Bancroft Way would be required to wait at the sidewalks while vehicles travel down Bancroft Way during the green traffic signal phase.
- If pedestrians are served concurrently with northbound vehicles on College Avenue, vehicles would be allowed to proceed without stopping on the approach to the intersection; vehicles are still required by law to stop for pedestrians in the crosswalks. Concurrent signals for vehicles and pedestrians would provide signalization with the least delay for AC Transit vehicles and pedestrians but may result in conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians.
- If an exclusive pedestrian signal phase is implemented to provide greater protection for pedestrians, pedestrians would have to wait during the green phase for vehicles turning left from College Avenue and AC Transit vehicles would have to wait for the exclusive pedestrian phase, resulting in higher delays for both pedestrians and AC Transit vehicles.
- Pedestrians facing “Don’t Walk” signal symbols may ignore the signal and enter the intersection when motor vehicles have the green light.
- Motor vehicle speeds are expected to increase during the green signal phase as vehicles approaching the intersection will not be required to stop as currently required by the stop signs; motorists traveling down Bancroft Way may further increase their speed during the yellow signal phase to “catch the light.”

As seen in Figure 2, there is currently relatively little space for pedestrians to wait at the south end of the west crosswalk. Given the high pedestrian crossing volume during peak periods, it is likely that a signal would overflow the sidewalk with waiting pedestrians. This pedestrian overflow is likely to obstruct pedestrian travel along Bancroft Way, as well as affect the entrance to Caffé Strada’s outdoor seating area.
Figure 2: Waiting Space on South Side of West Crosswalk

The Bancroft Way and College Avenue intersection is a sensitive area of Berkeley with high pedestrian activity, frequent deliveries, and numerous parking maneuvers. The traffic calming aspects of the stop signs are beneficial to the street’s pedestrian-friendly environment.

A traffic signal should only be installed after conducting an engineering study of traffic conditions and physical characteristics of the location. Furthermore, the installation of a traffic signal—even a warranted one—should take into consideration the potential effects on the pedestrian experience and operational efficiency and safety for all modes of travel. The preliminary recommendation is to reconsider the installation of a traffic signal, as it could deteriorate non-motorized quality of service at this vibrant, sensitive location.
Figure 3: Graphical Summary of Observations
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APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL ROUTE 51 REPORT MATERIALS

AC TRANSIT

Route 51 Service and Reliability Study

11. Prohibit left turns from College Avenue into Safeway parking lot near Claremont Avenue; close driveways to reduce delays to through movements on College Avenue.
12. Eliminate driveway on College Avenue into bank parking lot to reduce delays to through movements on College Avenue.

Northbound:
1. Relocate bus stop at Claremont Avenue to far side.
2. Prohibit left turns from College Avenue into Safeway parking lot near Claremont Avenue; close driveways.
3. Eliminate driveway from College Avenue into bank parking lot.
4. Coordinate the signals between Claremont Avenue and Alcatraz Avenue to improve traffic flow. This will require coordination between Oakland and Berkeley.
5. Remove bus stop at on College Avenue at Webster Street.
6. Create left turn pocket at Ashby Avenue to allow through traffic to bypass turning vehicles and cross intersection.
7. Replace stop sign at Russell Street with signal; coordinate with signal at Ashby Avenue to reduce queue and more adequately control traffic demand.
8. Install sign at Bancroft Avenue & College Avenue intersection to separate pedestrian and vehicle movements.
9. Remove bus stop on Bancroft Avenue at Bowditch Street.

AC TRANSIT

Route 51 Service and Reliability Study

Berkeley BART to Telegraph Avenue to Rockridge BART

Portions of this segment are tied to the future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alignment, and so recommended improvements to bus stops and routes are aligned with that project. This segment experiences nearly 3,500 boardings daily, and speeds are extremely slow (8 to 9 mph northbound, below 7 mph southbound). College Avenue is the most congested portion of the route, with speeds between 7 and 8 mph in each direction. The street is narrow, rarely has room for passing, and is highly congested because of the large number of destinations (including residential neighborhoods, commercial districts, freeway access and BART). There are several factors that contribute to this congestion: traffic controls which do not favor traffic movement or volumes, multiple curb cuts that allow left and right turns at poor locations, and closely spaced bus stops.

Figure 6.2 – 51 Route Map

St Route: Berkeley University and Mills to College and Ashby

Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

Oakland, California
APPENDIX B: CRASH REPORTS

10/17/13

COLLISION DETAILS: CASE ID 4251483

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>BERKELEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date (Y-M-D)</td>
<td>2009-04-23</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>15:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby Intersection</td>
<td>BANCROFT WY &amp; COLLEGE AV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Location</td>
<td>37.86980471, -122.2547335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>N Route</td>
<td>Postmile</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured Victims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Collision Factor</td>
<td>Unsafe Starting or Backing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved with</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STREET VIEW

Bancroft Way, Berkeley, California 2009.4.23 3:42 PM
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time.berkeley.edu/tools/query/collision_details.php?cn=4251483
**Collision Details: Case ID 5414543**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>BERKELEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date (Y-M-D)</td>
<td>2011-10-15</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>08:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby Intersection</td>
<td>BANCROFT WY &amp; COLLEGE AV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Location</td>
<td>37.86932, -122.25457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>N Route</td>
<td>- Postmile -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured Victims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Collision Factor</td>
<td>Unsafe Speed</td>
<td>Involved with</td>
<td>Other Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street View**

![Street View Image](image-url)
Transportation Commission
October 17, 2013

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael Katz [mailto:way.new@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 12:05 AM
To: Javandel, Farid
Subject: (10/17 Transp. Comm.:) AC Transit Line 51 Project - Minimizing biking impacts

Dear Farid Javandel,
Would you kindly forward these comments to the Transportation Commission? After attending AC Transit's 8/26/13 open house, I urge Public Works and Commissioners to consider the following concerns, listed by component of the project:

1) "Bus Bulbs" (Durant Ave. @Dana, Durant @Telegraph, and Durant @College, all eastbound):

These are a bad idea. Line 51's frequency does not justify the loss of space, nor the hazards, that these bulbs would cause to other uses and modes.

The bulb sketched for Durant/Dana is particularly awful. This is already a tight intersection, and jamming in the proposed wide bulb could create lethal hazards for cyclists. (There is substantial bicycle traffic on both Durant and Dana -- in Dana's case because of its marked bike lane leading off the UC campus beside the Haas pavilion.)

I can't imagine that bus merges at Durant/Dana are so severely delayed as to justify this detriment. If this bulb is built, it will probably be the source of a lawsuit -- either before or after some cyclists gets severely injured there.

Moving the three affected bus stop(s) to the far side of their signaled intersections -- or around the corner, in the case of College Ave. east/southbound -- should reduce merging delays without the drastic detriments of these bulbs. The City could also try posting advisory signs requesting "Please yield to merging buses," until we catch up to municipalities whose laws explicitly give merging buses right of way.

2) "Peak-hour bus-only lane, and/or Right-turn-only lane except buses" (University Ave. @Sacramento to California eastbound; University Ave. @Acton to McGee westbound):

* If implemented, I believe these should be implemented only as the right-turn plus bus option; not bus-only. The right-turn/bus option would reduce congestion for everyone. Line 51 does not seem to run frequently enough to justify exclusive use of a lane.

* I am assuming that these rules would apply only from 4-7 p.m. (as implied by the sample signage shown at the workshop). I feel that broader hours would be unwarranted.
Transportation Commission  
October 17, 2013

* Both rules and signage for these restricted lanes should explicitly address bicyclists, who are normally required by law to keep right. If cyclists are expected to use the rightmost lane, then the rules and signage should read something like: "Right-turn-only lane, except buses and bicycles."

If cyclists are expected to shift one lane leftward when the right lane is restricted, then there should be clear signage explaining this. Whatever the rules, the alternative to clear signage is chaos. Cyclists will needlessly conflict with buses, or else change lanes unpredictably, or else end up on the sidewalk.

3) Peak-hour (4-7 p.m.) "Queue-jump/right-turn lanes" (University Ave. @MLK, east- and westbound; College @Russell eastbound; University @Sacramento westbound):

* Same concern as for bus-only lanes: To avoid chaos, rules and signage should direct cyclists to one, clearly-defined, lane.

4) Remove two bus stops (University Ave. @McGee eastbound; University @Curtis westbound):

AC Transit was wise to shrink this target list (from the 2008 study) to just two stops. Please heed comments from affected riders about the impact of removing these stops.

A minor delay reduction would not justify imposing significant burdens on mobility-impaired (elderly and/or disabled) riders. If AC Transit wants to REALLY speed up Line 51, it should consider alternating local runs with an overlaid 51 Express, or else implementing A/B skip-stop service.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Respectfully yours,

Michael Katz  
2117 Rose St., #9  
Berkeley, CA 94709  
<way.new@earthlink.net>
Hello there,
I am unable to attend the Transportation Commission meeting tomorrow night. So, I want to convey to you that it is important to me that the Commission support bike lanes on Tunnel Road and also bike lanes behind the bus bulbs for AC Transit 51 lines. I feel very strongly that we need to do more as a city to ensure the safety of bicyclists on our roads.
Thank you very much,
Steve Gere
2220 Sacramento St
Berkeley CA 94702
510-704-8242
To: The City of Berkeley Council, Mayor Tom Bates, and AC Transit

We, the undersigned oppose the AC Transit Line 51- Corridor Delay Reduction & Sustainability Project for following reasons.

University Ave is a gateway to UC, Berkeley which draws people from local, national and the world. It is important to have visible ample supply of parking. Removing parking of any number would irreparably harm the business and residential community. We at University Ave. Association think that there are options that can be utilized without taking away parking at anytime without bringing unbearable financial burden to the businesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harold Turner</td>
<td>1063 12th St.</td>
<td>Harold Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Bechtel</td>
<td>1034 Delaware St.</td>
<td>Sun Bechtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>1034 Delaware St.</td>
<td>Waldo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Chin</td>
<td>1515 Francisco St.</td>
<td>Mary Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Chin</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Tyler Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Ray Young</td>
<td>1420 Lincoln St.</td>
<td>El Ray Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Ashley</td>
<td>1420 Lincoln St.</td>
<td>Kevin Ashley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>1420 Lincoln St.</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Thompson</td>
<td>443 Irving St.</td>
<td>Nancy Thompson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>